

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 03-2361

ISLAM A. AHMED,

Petitioner,

versus

JOHN ASHCROFT,

Respondent.

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals. (A78-600-949)

Submitted: September 29, 2004

Decided: October 14, 2004

Before NIEMEYER, MOTZ, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

James A. Roberts, LAW OFFICES OF JAMES A. ROBERTS, Falls Church, Virginia, for Petitioner. Peter D. Keisler, Assistant Attorney General, Margaret J. Perry, Senior Litigation Counsel, Jacqueline R. Dryden, OFFICE OF IMMIGRATION LITIGATION, Washington, D.C., for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Islam A. Ahmed, a native and citizen of Sudan, seeks review of a decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals (Board) affirming without opinion the Immigration Judge's (IJ) denial of her applications for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture (CAT).

We first reject Ahmed's claim that she established eligibility for asylum and withholding of removal.* To obtain reversal of a determination denying eligibility for relief, an alien "must show that the evidence he presented was so compelling that no reasonable factfinder could fail to find the requisite fear of persecution." INS v. Elias-Zacarias, 502 U.S. 478, 483-84 (1992). We have reviewed the evidence of record and conclude that Ahmed fails to show that the evidence compels a contrary result. Ahmed thus cannot meet the higher standard for withholding of removal. See INS v. Cardoza-Fonseca, 480 U.S. 421, 430 (1987).

Ahmed next claims that the Board's summary affirmance of her specific case violated her right to due process because the IJ's denial of asylum and withholding of removal was in error and because he failed to fully address her claims. See 8 C.F.R. § 1003.1(a)(7) (2004). We have reviewed the administrative record and the IJ's decision and conclude that Ahmed's claim is without merit. See Blanco de Belbruno v. Ashcroft, 362 F.3d 272, 281, 283

*Ahmed does not dispute the denial of CAT relief.

(4th Cir. 2004); Rusu v. INS, 296 F.3d 316, 324-25 (4th Cir. 2002);
8 C.F.R § 1003.1(a)(7)(ii) (2004).

Accordingly, we deny the petition for review. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DENIED